SINGLE BENCH

CP 1002 — (2) (4)

BEFORE THE HON'BLE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR (C.G.)

Writ Petition (S) No. 1963 /2007

PETITIONER

Kumari Elezabeth Lakda (after marriage Elezabeth Xalxo), wife of Domentius Xalxo, aged about 44 years, working as Assistant Teacher, Department of Education, Government Primary School – Girhaildih, resident of Kunkuri, Tahsil Kunkuri, Distt. Jashpur (C.G.) (Sl.No. 5 of the Impugned Order P-1)

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS

1. State of Chhattisgarh, through the Secretary, Department of School Education, Dau Kalyan Singh Bhawan, Raipur (C.G.)
2. District Education Officer, Distt. Jashpur (C.G.)
3. Block Education Officer, Block Kunkuri, Distt. Jashpur (C.G.)

RECEIVED-COPY
CLERK to A. G. BILASPUR

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLES 226 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

(85)

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

W.P. (S) No. 1963 of 2007

Petitioner : Kumari Elezabeth Lakda (after marriage Elezabeth xalxo), wife of Domentius Xalxo, aged about 44 years, working as Assistant Teacher, Department of Education, Government Primary School - Girhaildih, resident of Kunkuri, Tahsil Kunkuri, Distt. Jashpur (C.G.) (Sl. No. 5 of the Impuguned Order P-1)

Versus

Respondents

1. State of Chhattisgarh, through the Secretary, Department of School Education, Dau Kalyan Singh Bhawan, Raipur (C.G.)
2. District Education Officer, Distt. Jashpur (C.G.)
3. Block Education Officer, Block Kunkuri, Distt. Jashpur (C.G.)

Present: Mr. Harish Khuntiya, Advocate for the petitioner.
Ms. Sunita Jain, Panel Lawyer for State/respondents.

O R D E R

(Passed on this 2nd Day of April, 2007)

1. The question of law involved herein asto whether the petitioner is entitled to regular pay scale w.e.f. the date of initial appointment or from the date of completion of probation period.

2. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner as well as for the State/respondents jointly submit that the facts and question of law involved the present writ petition are the same as to that of in W.P. (S) No. 4725/2006 (Amar Sai Ram & others Vs. State of Chhattisgarh & others), which was disposed of vide order dated 1.9.2006.

3. In view of the above-stated submissions made by learned counsel for the parties, the writ petition is disposed of in the same terms. No order as to costs.

Sd/-
Satish K.Agnihotri
Judge

Subhash